

AGRIMONIA ODORATA, AITON.

In the course of an examination of my native species of *Rosaceæ*, I have had the fortune to detect a good specimen, in fruit, of the *Agrimonia odorata* of the Hortus Kewensis, given to me by the Rev. W. W. Newbould, who gathered it at Beaumont in the island of Jersey on the 15th of August 1842. I believe this to be the only continental plant, not known as a native of Britain, which has been added to the flora of the Channel Islands since the publication of the 'Primitiæ Floræ Sarnicæ.' It is distinguished from *A. Eupatoria*, which it greatly resembles, by its "greater size,—three to four feet high;" leaves more deeply and more sharply cut, hairy and furnished with scattered glands beneath, not cano-tomentose; tube of the calyx of the fruit larger but shorter, bell-shaped or nearly hemispherical, not turbinate, uniformly hairy and glandular, only furrowed in its upper half, and even there the furrows are shallow; spines longer, and the lower ones strongly reflexed; petals "saturate aureis," red in the dried specimen. It will probably be detected in some of our southern counties if diligently looked for.—C. C. B.

HASSALL'S "BRITISH FRESHWATER ALGÆ."

The Editors think it right to make a few observations upon Mr. Hassall's letter printed in the last number of these 'Annals,' and to which these remarks would have been appended, had they not thought that they might as well allow their readers one month's opportunity of contrasting the letter and the review, believing that the latter is by far the best answer to most points brought forward in the former. They wish it to be distinctly understood that they are not again reviewing the work, and do not intend to be drawn into a paper war, which would be totally out of place here.

Mr. Hassall complains that the review contains animadversions which a careful and candid examination of the work will not justify; they have now to state that a re-examination has only convinced them that the reviewer has been very lenient, and that Mr. Hassall should have been well-satisfied when he reflects how plentifully he has appropriated to himself the labours of others.

Suppose that Mr. Hassall had been engaged for the last two or three years in bringing out periodically original and elaborate figures with descriptions, as Mr. Ralfs has done, and that some compiler, watching close at his heels, had instantly and without ceremony copied a very large number of his figures, and given them to the world as his own, would Mr. Hassall have been content to acquiesce without complaint or remonstrance? To say nothing of the illegality of such a proceeding (which however is clear enough), there is too much reason to complain of its injustice and disingenuousness.

It is to little purpose that Mr. Hassall states that "no one plate is a copy of any one of Mr. Ralfs's," when the figures of which they are composed are palpably so, although by transpositions and inversions the identity of the plates is disguised.

Our readers may judge for themselves by comparing the plates of *Desmideæ* in both works: they will see that there is not a single